

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11-14, 20-24, and 27-33 remain in this application. Claims 4, 9, 10, 22, 27 and 29 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination.

Claims 11-14 were withdrawn from consideration pending the allowability of claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 1, as currently amended, is allowable and respectfully submits that claims 11-14 which depend from claim 1, are also be allowable. Applicant respectfully requests the reinstatement and allowance of claims 11-14.

The drawings were objected to for failing to include several reference signs mentioned in the specification. Besides the reference signs identified by the Examiner as missing from the drawings, Applicant noted several additional missing reference signs from Figures 6 and 7. Applicant submits herewith under separate cover to the Official Draftsperson, copies of two (2) sheets of drawings showing proposed reference sign additions to Figures 1, 6, 7 and 8. Applicant requests permission to make these changes.

The disclosure was objected to because of an informality on page 6. Besides the informality noted by the Examiner, Applicant noted that there were several additional informalities in paragraph 0031 of the specification and submits herewith an amended paragraph 0031 that obviates all the informalities.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement in that the specification did not support a cuboid support member. The Examiner correctly noted, the specification does state the support member may be rectangular. Claim 32 has been amended to recite that the support member is rectangular. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 20-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. The Office Action specifically points out that claims 28 and 30 lack antecedent basis for “coupling member” and “support member”. Claims 28 and 30 have been amended to depend from amended claim 27 which provides the antecedent basis for the coupling member and support member recited in claims 28 and 30. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 25, 28, 30, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the German patent (DE 2,923,893). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 25 has been cancelled. Claim 27, which depends from claim 25, has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 27 has been amended to independent form to include all the elements of claim 25. It is respectfully submitted that claim 27 is therefore allowable.

Claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 27. Claim 28 is seen as allowable.

Claim 30 has been amended to depend from claim 27. Claim 30 is also seen as allowable.

Claim 31 and 33 indirectly depend from claim 27 and are also seen as allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 28, 30, 31 and 33 in light of the German patent, be withdrawn.

Claims 25, 28, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Laughlin* (US 5,740,994). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As set forth above, claim 27 is allowable.

Claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 27. Claim 30 has been amended to depend from claim 27. Claim 31 depends from claim 30.

It is respectfully submitted that because all these claims directly or indirectly depend from allowable independent claim 27, they are also allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by admitted prior art shown in the application. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 4 of the application has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 4. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is seen as allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the German patent. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 26 has been cancelled. Claim 32 indirectly depends from allowable independent claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Laughlin* in view of the German patent. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 33 indirectly depends from allowable claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claim 33 be withdrawn.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Laughlin*. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 32 indirectly depends from allowable claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted prior art in the application, in view of *Rancourt* (US 4,979,715). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, contains the allowable subject matter of claim 4. It is therefore seen as allowable.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is therefore also seen as allowable.

Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Claims 5, 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also seen as allowable.

Claim 20 depends from allowable claim 1 and is also seen as allowable. Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and is therefore also seen as allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 20 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of *Laughlin* and the German patent. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 8 depends from allowable claim 1 and therefore is also allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claim 22 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 22 has been rewritten in independent form.

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of *Rancourt* and Figure 2 of the application, which is an illustration of prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 23 depends from claim 21. Claim 22 is seen as allowable which depends from claim 20 which depends from allowable claim 1. Claim 24 depends from claim 23. Claims 23 and 24 are therefore also seen as allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claim 23 and 24 be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes that this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that all the rejections and objections be withdrawn and this application be passed to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 12, 2004.

By: Kimila Carraway

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Dated: November 12, 2004

Very truly yours,

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Albin H. Gess  
Registration No. 25,726  
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200  
Irvine, California 92614-7230  
Telephone: (949) 253-4920

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

A letter to the chief draftsman is enclosed, including two (2) sheets of drawings, showing proposed changes in red to Figure 1, Figure 6, Figure 7 and Figure 8, and requesting permission to make those changes.